

# Report: Survey of Nontenure-track Faculty at Colorado State University—2014

---

## Introduction

In his Fall 2013 address, President Tony Frank in a sense declared Academic Year 2013-2014 “the year of the adjunct” when he said, “We have ambitious goals for our academic programs at Colorado State, and they cannot be achieved without the full engagement of our adjunct faculty,” and exhorted “Provost Miranda and our faculty to take our focus on adjuncts to the next level and continue to make improvements” in “pay and benefits, job security, advancement, and participation in the life of the university.” Accepting Frank’s charge to build on the progress of recent years yet “do more,” the Center for the Study of Academic Labor (CSAL) at Colorado State conducted this survey in an effort to both assess the impact of the gains to which President Frank alluded and to investigate the current conditions of faculty working off the tenure-track at CSU.

CSAL was formed in 2013 to promote and conduct scholarship on academic labor, including investigations of working conditions of contingent faculty and the expanding role of non-tenure track faculty in the activities of higher education. Conducting this survey enacts CSAL’s objective of developing empirical research practices that can support evidence-based policy deliberations and higher education stakeholders working toward educational excellence, equity, and efficacy.

The survey instrument is based on one administered in May 2009 by the Provost’s Task Force “to better understand the issues and concerns of nontenure-track faculty on the Colorado State University campus.” Although a few items were revised or added to account for changes since 2009, such as the availability of senior teaching appointments, or to clarify language, the 2009 and 2014 instruments are closely aligned in order to facilitate comparison.

In the years between surveys, much has changed in the context surrounding nontenure-track faculty (NTTF) at CSU. In Fall 2009, Faculty Council added the Committee on Special and Temporary Faculty (CoSTF), the first Faculty Council advisory committee constituted of and for NTTF at CSU. CoSTF initiated such changes as the creation of the Senior Teaching Appointment and eligibility for emeritus status for NTTF. CoSTF joined with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and with university lobbyists to support legislation (HB1144) sponsored by Representative Randy Fischer, which was signed into law in April 2012 by Governor John Hickenlooper, and removed the legal obstacle to offering multi-year contracts to NTTF. CoSTF then worked closely with Faculty Council and CSU central administration to successfully persuade the CSU Board of Governors to make such contracts an option available at CSU. Now called the Committee on Nontenure-

track Faculty (CoNTTF), this group recently secured a vote in Faculty Council for the CoNTTF chair, the first NTTF voting member of CSU's faculty governance body.

In 2009, NTTF numbered 499 or approximately 33% of the total faculty (Provost's Task Force, p. 1). According to the 2013-2014 *Fact Book*, CSU's 665 special and temporary faculty are now 39% of total faculty. This shows continuing growth in the percentage of total faculty who work off the tenure-track, a trend that the 2009 Survey report noted had been in place for at least the 10 years prior to its publication. In fact, since 2004-2005, the number of special and temporary faculty at CSU has increased 115% (*Fact Book*, p. 122). In academic year (AY) 2013-2014, the largest number of faculty on special appointments worked in the Colleges of Liberal Arts (219), Health & Human Sciences (59), and Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Science (57) ( p. 117).

Currently, NTTF contribute significantly to the instructional mission of the university. In AY 2013-2014, NTTF produced as much of undergraduate credit hours (41%) as tenured and tenure-track faculty (40%).<sup>1</sup>

As the 2009 Survey did, this survey sought a broad definition of "NTTF" to comprise the target population. In addition to the three categories from Sections D and E of the Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual that the 2009 Survey included—special, temporary, and joint academic and administrative professional appointments—the population for the 2014 survey includes Senior Teaching appointment, which has been available since 2012.

The survey was distributed by sending a hyperlink to its location on the Baseline web site to email addresses of 1273 employees. These addresses were obtained from a list of NTTF provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and a list of NTTF and administrative professionals provided by Institutional Research. Although efforts were made to verify these lists, CSAL recognizes the limitations of the survey target population, especially regarding those who do not hold special, temporary, or senior teaching faculty appointments. We are cognizant that despite our best efforts we may have overlooked some administrative professionals for whom a substantial portion of their duties resemble those of faculty. Identifying all who do the work of academic faculty—including employees of CSU extension, CSU Global, and INTO CSU—is an ongoing project that will require the collaboration of several entities from central administration to Human Resources to employee groups such as the Faculty and Administrative-Professional Councils. Further, we did not include Graduate Teaching Assistants, who in 2013-2014 were responsible for production of 12% of undergraduate credit hours.

This report mirrors the structure of the survey and adds a comparison with 2009 results in sections as follows:

- Section 1: describes respondents to the survey

---

<sup>1</sup> The remaining undergraduate teaching load is borne by graduate assistants 12%, and other employees 7%.

- Section 2: surveys participants on a set of job satisfaction indicators
- Section 3: obtains participant insights into hiring and evaluation
- Section 4: queries respondents about material conditions of employment and evidence of recognitions and rewards for nontenure-track faculty.
- Section 5: asks about representation to faculty governance and perceived administrative support
- Section 6: invites respondents to reply to open-ended questions about the major employment issues facing contingent faculty and respondents' ideas for improving circumstances and responding to concerns
- Section 7: compares 2014 results with those from 2009 to identify trends, change, and areas of ongoing concern.

The survey was created using the Baseline platform provided through Campus Labs. It was launched on May 19, 2014 and remained open until June 9, 2014, with a reminder email message sent June 2. With 487 respondents, the survey had a response rate of 38.26%. This is considerably lower than the 60% response rate of the 2009 survey, but it must be noted that the effort to identify joint appointment faculty in 2014 resulted in a significantly larger pool of potential respondents. Further, the raw numbers of special and temporary faculty had increased and senior teaching appointments had been added as well.

This report focuses on aggregate data for the entire university. Narrative responses from several open-ended questions are briefly summarized in Section VI Open-Ended Questions: Issues, Ideas, and Further Thoughts.

The report also includes several appendices. They are as follows:

- Appendix A provides a full list of the 119 survey questions.
- Appendix B provides the aggregated survey responses, minus the open-ended responses
- Appendix C provides the disaggregated responses for each College
- Appendix D provides a distillation of responses to the open-ended questions

## I. Description of the Respondents

### A. General Descriptors

Of those responding, 60.5% were women and 39.5% were men. Forty-one percent of responding faculty had been employed by CSU for ten or more years as of May-June 2014. Eighty per cent described themselves as being the primary instructors for one or more courses at CSU, while just fewer than 19% described their positions as primarily research appointments. Just fewer than 4% cited their position as comprised of primarily clinical responsibilities. About 20% of respondents hold a joint administrative professional-faculty appointment.

Respondents were asked to quantify the percentage of their position involved with teaching and research from 0-100% in ten-percentage-point increments. Almost 90% indicated that *teaching* represented some percentage of their workload, with 58.11 % citing teaching as the

majority of it. Just fewer than 16.22% cited *research* as more than half of their responsibilities while 57.2% reported no research responsibilities. A smaller yet still substantial number of respondents report no service responsibilities (35.6%), with 26% reporting that service comprises 1-10% of their workload.

Around 64% hold the rank of Instructor, with 26.1% assistant professors, 3.77% associate professors, 2.2% full professors, and 3.77% not knowing their rank. This sample does not align completely with CSU's employee data. According to the 2013-2014 *Fact Book*, instructors comprise nearly 77% of faculty, assistant professors 17%, with full and associates each representing about 3%.

Similarly, self-reported appointment types from the sample do not correspond precisely with CSU data. The *Fact Book* reports 57.6% of NTTF faculty on special appointments, 36% as temporary, and 6.3% senior teaching. Respondents reported their appointment category as 41.5% Special, 20.09% temporary, 8.6% Senior Teaching, and 29.58% administrative professional. Clearly, the presence of respondents who report as administrative professionals affects the distribution of NTTF appointment types. The administrative professional result also raises the question of why nearly 30% of respondents identify their appointment type as administrative professional while only 20% say they have a joint administrative professional-faculty appointment.

One respondent identified as a graduate teaching assistant.<sup>2</sup>

## B. College Affiliation

The top two colleges in numbers of special, temporary, and senior teaching appointments<sup>3</sup>, according to the 2013-2014 *Fact Book*, represented the largest groups of survey respondents, with 31.6% of respondents from the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and 16% from the College of Health and Human Sciences (CHHS). Although the College of Natural Science (CNS) ranks fifth in the number of NTTF, however, it was third in proportion of survey respondents at 15%, followed by 7% each from the Colleges of Business (COB) and Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences (CVMBS), 6% from the College of Agricultural Science (CAS), and 3.5% from the College of Engineering (COE). Thirty respondents chose "Other," specifying 25 unique affiliations. Some of these are indeed affiliated with the above colleges, e.g. "College of Education" and "Social Work" both are housed in the CHHS. The discrepancy in college distributions is likely due not only to such variation in self-reported affiliations but also to the inclusion of administrative professionals, whose numbers cannot adequately be compared to CSU data due to factors referred to above.

---

<sup>2</sup> Noting that 453 of 487 total respondents completed this item and considering anecdotal feedback from survey participants, some respondents may not know their appointment type and/or may hold some other appointment type. This item will be revised for future surveys to capture a more complete representation of self-reported appointment types.

<sup>3</sup> The *Fact Book* does not disaggregate Senior Teaching Appointment faculty but includes them among Special Faculty.

### College Affiliation of Special and Temporary Faculty from 2013-2014 *Fact Book*

Unit	NTT Faculty	Percent of total
Liberal Arts	288	43.31
Health & Human Sciences	148	22.26
Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Science	63	9.47
Business	53	7.97
Natural Sciences	46	6.92
Engineering	17	2.56
Warner College of Natural Resources	12	1.8
Non-college	9	1.35
Libraries	4	.6
Agriculture	25	3.76%
<b>Total</b>	<b>665</b>	<b>100</b>

### College Affiliation of Survey Respondents

Unit	Count	Percent
Liberal Arts	143	31.58
Health & Human Sciences	75	16.56
Natural Sciences	60	13.25
Warner College of Natural Resources	36	7.95
Business	33	7.28
Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Science	33	7.28
Other	30	6.62
Engineering	16	3.53
Agriculture	27	5.95%
<b>Total</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>100</b>

## C. Duties/Job Responsibilities—Teaching, Research, and Other Activities

### *Teaching*

Teaching comprised more than half of the workload of 58% of respondents and 20% or less of the duties of 26% of respondents. Notably, 39.6% said that teaching represents 91-100% of their duties while 8.1% cited no teaching among their responsibilities.

Although survey respondents across all college affiliations reported teaching as at least a portion of their duties, teaching was most prevalent in the workload distributions of respondents from Colleges of Business, Liberal Arts, Health and Human Sciences, and Natural Sciences. Teaching often represents a significantly smaller percentage of the

workload of respondents in the Colleges of Agriculture, Engineering, Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Science, and Natural Resources as well as for those who cited Other unit affiliations.

### Teaching as a percentage of responsibilities by unit affiliation

Unit	Total respondents to Q19	percent Teaching =>50%	percent Teaching 20% or less
<b>Agriculture</b>	27		48%
<b>Business</b>	33	90%	
<b>Engineering</b>	15		47
<b>Health &amp; Human Sciences</b>	74	54	
<b>Liberal Arts</b>	138	82	
<b>Natural Sciences</b>	59	49	
<b>Veterinary Medicine &amp; Biomedical Science</b>	33		45
<b>Warner College of Natural Resources</b>	36		47
<b>Other</b>	29		44

Among the 374 respondents who report teaching as a percentage of their workload distribution, 62.8% teach 1-2 classes per semester, 29.4% teach 3-4, and 7.8% teach 5 or more courses per semester. Of the 382 respondents who report an average class size for courses they teach, 100-500 students per class is most common at 30%, with 27.6% teaching classes with fewer than 30 students, 17% with 30-49 students, 21.4% with 50-100 students. The vast majority of these classes are residential instruction as only 19.4% of respondents reported teaching classes that students take completely online.

### Research

Research comprised a much smaller percentage of the workload of the majority of respondents. Seventy-four per cent said that 20% or less of their job was research, with 57% reporting no research responsibilities. Only 16.2% of respondents reported research as more than 50% of their workload distribution. Respondents from the College of Business, Health and Human Sciences, and Liberal Arts as well as those claiming Other affiliation were least likely to report research as a portion of their workload. A significant portion of these

respondents reported no research responsibilities: 72% in Liberal Arts, 70% in Business, 67.6% in Health and Human Sciences, and 65.5% of Other.

Although no group of respondents reported all of its workload being comprised of research, 46% of Engineering respondents cited research as 51% or more of their workload distribution. Around a third of Natural Sciences, Warner Natural Resources, and Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Science respondents reported 51% or more workload from research.

### Research as a percentage of responsibilities by unit affiliation

Unit	Total respondents to Q20	Percent Research <50%	Percent Research 20% or less
Agriculture	27.00	33.00	51.80
Business	33.00	0.00	94.00
Engineering	15.00	46.00	40.00
Health & Human Sciences	74.00	8.00	86.50
Liberal Arts	138.00	2.00	85.50
Natural Sciences	59.00	35.50	62.70
Veterinary Medicine & Biomedical Science	33.00	36.30	42.40
Warner College of Natural Resources	36.00	36.00	52.80
Other	29.00	3.00	86.20

### Service and Other Responsibilities

Survey respondents were also asked to quantify the percent of their responsibilities comprised by service. Typically, respondents reported little or no service component, as 35.5% reported no service and 26.8% cite service as 1-10% of their workload distribution. A small group (6%), however, reported service as 80% or more of their job.

Responses to the item that asked about responsibilities other than teaching, research, or service, however, raised questions about how respondents categorize the components of their workload distribution. The 35.1% of respondents who listed other responsibilities named a wide range of activities. "Advising" and "Administration" appeared frequently, as did activities such as directing, coordinating, supervising, mentoring, training, and developing curriculum. Such responses may indicate that communication of which activities

qualify as teaching, research, or service could be improved. These responses reveal as well that those CSU employees who identify as NTTF are engaged in activities essential to the research, teaching, service, and outreach missions of the university.

## II. Job Satisfaction

### Importance of various job criteria to job satisfaction

This study examined the importance to job satisfaction of various aspects, including salary student contact, contact with colleagues, autonomy, working collaboratively, having a flexible schedule, having the freedom to create and execute classes, having the freedom to conduct research, feeling valued as a professional, having excellent research facilities, having excellent research opportunities, being mentored, obtaining professional development, being involved in departmental activities, being involved in departmental governance, being intellectually stimulated, enjoying collegiality, feeling fairly treated, exercising academic freedom, and having secure or stable employment. Respondents also responded to their level of satisfaction with respect to each of these criteria.

Faculty assessed the importance of various attributes of their job in relation to their job satisfaction, using a five-point scale ranging from “extremely important” to “not at all important.” The results presented here take into account those participants for whom the attributes were applicable, thus all the percentages do not total 100% (as non-applicable responses are what remains). While 77.8% indicated salary was very important or extremely important, 20.8% noted salary was moderately or slightly important. Only 1.2% of the respondents noted that salary was not important.

With regard to the importance of student contact to their job satisfaction, 78.7% of the participants reported they found student contact extremely or very important, while 18.3% reported moderate or slight importance and 1.9% indicated student contact was not important.

Rating the importance of contact with colleagues to one’s job satisfaction showed 66.7% indicating colleague contact as extremely or very important, 30.8% reporting moderate or slight importance and 2.6% reporting this was not important.

As to autonomy’s importance to job satisfaction, 73.6% of the respondents indicated autonomy was extreme or very important, 23.4% reported this was moderately or slightly important and 2.6% noted this was unimportant.

Working collaboratively was assessed as to its importance to job satisfaction, yielding 63.2% of the respondents’ rating this as extremely or very important, 30.6% rating this as moderately or slightly important, and 5.3% rating this as not important.

Having a flexible schedule as important to job satisfaction was noted as extremely or very important by 78.9%, moderately or slightly important by 17.1% and of no importance by 2.1% of the participants.

Having freedom to create and execute classes with regard to its importance to job satisfaction was noted as extremely or very important by 71.5%, moderately or slightly important by 17.1%, and of no importance by 9.3% of the faculty who responded.

While 35.6% of the participants rated the importance of being free to conduct research as extremely or very important to job satisfaction, 24.1% indicated moderate or slight importance and 8.6% reported no importance. In this question, 31.7% reported non-applicability.

With regard to their feeling valued as a professional as part of their job satisfaction, 89.9% of the faculty noted this was extremely or very important, 9.3% reported this as slightly or moderately important, and less than 1.0% noted this was not important.

While 29.6% of the respondents noted that having excellent research facilities was extremely or very important, 28.7% indicated this was moderately or slightly important and 10.9% rated this as not important. Here, 30.8% of the respondents noted the question was not applicable.

Having excellent research facilities as importance in job satisfaction showed 32.9% rating this as extremely or very important, 26.4% rating this as moderately or slightly important, and 10.4% noting this was not important. Here, 30.3% of the respondents noted the question was not applicable.

Being mentored was found extremely or very important by 36.1% of the respondents with regard to their job satisfaction, while 42.8% found it moderately or slightly important, and 13.7% indicated it was not important.

While 56.0% rated obtaining professional development as extremely or very important, 33.8% noted it was moderately or slightly important, and 6.5% reported this was not important.

Being involved in departmental activities as important to job satisfaction showed 41.7% of the respondents indicated this was extremely or very important, 48.9% rated it as moderately or slightly important, and 8.6% noted it was not important.

Similarly, being a part of departmental governance was rated as to its importance to job satisfaction. While 26.8% of the respondents noted this was extremely or very important, 48.9% indicated moderate or slight importance, and 18.5% noted this was not important. The importance to one's job satisfaction of being intellectually stimulated showed 89.8% of the participants rated this as extremely or very important, 9.3% rated this as moderately or slightly important, and less than 1% indicated this was not important.

While 73.8% rated enjoying collegiality as extremely or very important to job satisfaction, 22.2% indicated moderate or slight importance, and 3.0% reported this was not important.

While 95.6% rated being treated fairly as extremely or very important to job satisfaction, 4.2% indicated moderate or slight importance, and less than 1.0% indicated this was not important.

While 82.2% of the faculty survey reported exercising academic freedom as extremely or very important to job satisfaction, 13.7% noted this was moderately or slightly important, and 1.9% reported this was not important.

Having secure or stable employment was rated by 85% of the participants as extremely or very important relative to job satisfaction, while 12.3% reported moderate or slight importance and 1.9% indicated this was not important.

After responding to these varied importance to job satisfaction items, respondents noted their actual levels of satisfaction for the same items that gauged importance. Satisfaction with salary showed only 9.3% of the respondents were extremely satisfied with their salaries, 36.1% of the respondents were very satisfied (here we did not combine the top two responses of extremely and very satisfied, because of the much smaller percent reporting extreme satisfaction), 16% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 23.4% were moderately dissatisfied, and 15.3% were very dissatisfied. Thus, 38.7% of the participants expressed dissatisfaction with their salaries.

While 83.6% of the respondents reported being satisfied about student contact, 10.4% indicated they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 3.5% expressed dissatisfaction. While 70.1% of the respondents reported they were satisfied about contact with colleagues, 17.4% indicated they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 11.8% indicated they were dissatisfied.

Satisfaction with autonomy yielded 80.1% satisfied, 14.4% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 5.1% dissatisfied.

Satisfaction with working collaboratively yielded 63.7% satisfied, 21.1% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 10.4% dissatisfied.

While 82.% of the respondents reported being satisfied with having a flexible schedule, 11.81% indicated neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction, and 4.4% reported dissatisfaction. As to satisfaction with the freedom to create and execute classes, 70% noted they were satisfied, 13.7% noted neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction and 6.0% expressed dissatisfaction.

Although 40% of the participants indicated that having freedom to conduct research was not applicable to them, for those who responded 33.3% showed satisfaction, 17.8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 8.8% were dissatisfied with their freedom to conduct research. Satisfaction with feeling valued as a professional yielded 47% of the respondents being satisfied, 18.5% neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 34.0% dissatisfied.

With 45.1% of the participants indicating non-applicability regarding satisfaction with research facilities, 18.1% noted satisfaction with research facilities, while 26.6% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 10.2% were dissatisfied.

Similarly, 43.8% indicated the non-applicability of their being satisfied with research opportunities. While 19.4% reported satisfaction with research opportunities, 23.6% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 13.2% were dissatisfied.

Satisfaction with being mentored yielded 31.7% being satisfied, 33.1% being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 20.8% being dissatisfied.

Satisfaction with obtaining professional development showed 38.7% were satisfied, 31.7% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 23.4% were dissatisfied.

While 42.4% of the respondents indicated they were satisfied with being involved in departmental activities, 32.2% indicated they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 19.2% were dissatisfied.

As for satisfaction with being part of departmental governance, 23.9% showed satisfaction, 35.9% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 24.1% were dissatisfied.

While 71.5% reported satisfaction with being intellectually stimulated, 19.4% showed neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction, and 8.6% reported dissatisfaction.

While 59.5% noted they were satisfied with their level of enjoying collegiality, 25.9% indicated they were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 13.2% reported being dissatisfied.

Satisfaction with being treated fairly yielded 49.1% of the respondents indicating satisfaction, 16.7% being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 34.3% were dissatisfied.

Satisfaction with their level of academic freedom yielded 64.4% of the participants showing satisfaction, 23.4% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 6.9% were dissatisfied.

Asked about their satisfaction with having secure or stable employment, 41.8% were satisfied, 17.1% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 40.7% were dissatisfied.

Having measured these many criteria for importance, it is useful to determine how these items clustered together to represent factors, or dimensions, of importance. This provides a more parsimonious view of these data, with regard to meanings assigned to these items by the respondents. Factor analysis, using Varimax rotation, determined five clean dimensions, accounting for 62.7% of the variance). This means that items that respondents answered similarly loaded on each specific dimension, or factor, in some meaningful way that characterizes those items and that discriminates those items from other dimensions (with other items that cluster from similar loadings).

For these importance factors, the first dimension, which accounted for 16.1% of the total variance, tapped Departmental Dyadic and Group Engagement: collaboration, contact with colleagues, mentoring, professional development, departmental activities, and departmental governance.

The second dimension, which accounted for 14.7% of the variance and comprised Research criteria, represented freedom to conduct research, research opportunities, and having excellent research facilities.

The third dimension, accounting for 14.2% of the variance, involved the importance of student contact, being valued as a professional, enjoying collegiality, and being treated fairly—all Core Professional Norms and Ethics of college teachers, generally.

Dimension four tapped classic Academic Freedom issues: autonomy, flexibility in scheduling, the freedom create and to execute classes, and academic freedom. This dimension accounted for an additional 9.7% of the variance.

The fifth dimension in this analysis comprised salary and secure or stable employment, labeled Treatment and adding 8.1% of variation to this analysis, suggesting its strength. Its loading as the last “dimension” or factor should not diminish its importance in this study; rather, it suggests it is likely much more complex than simply how much money one brings in and the longevity of employment. It would seem prudent to further investigate this, using many more items or represent salary and security issues, for example: how important salary is in relationship to other special faculty; relative to tenure-track faculty; relative to peers in the profession; relative to special faculty at Colorado State University’s peer institutions; the importance of salary increases; a contract; tenure; being given enough planning time for class preparations; and benefits such as health, time off, leaves of absence. Further research into this might examine the extent to which special faculty internalize their lower salary and lack of security as a legitimate norm, a sort of internalized marginalization that may exist. This also might be represented by this factor analysis regarding salary’s and security’s importance in a job, given nontenure-track faculty may enter the market for this type of position holding internalized views that manifest into expectations and possibly acceptance of a low salary and security.

All the above dimensions showed reliability at or above Cronbach’s  $\alpha = .72$ , with salary and security correlating.

### **Job satisfaction**

Using the same items, this time relative to the level of satisfaction individual respondents experienced with each of the same criteria measured above for its importance, the factor analysis showed some similarity. It clustered into four clean dimensions, accounting for 61.2% of the variance. Two of the dimensions resembled the first factor analysis above.

The first dimension, which included nearly the same items as those in the first dimension of the importance factor analysis, was labeled Department Dyadic and Group Engagement (accounting for 20.3% of the variance). The satisfaction items clustering in this dimension,

or factor are contact with colleagues, collaboration, mentoring, engaging in departmental governance, professional development, freedom to conduct research, and enjoying collegiality.

The second dimension (accounting for 15.7% of the variance) tapped traditional Professional Academic Norms and expectations, which on their face would seem to describe criteria of satisfaction for any professor of higher learning regardless of status as tenure or nontenure-track: autonomy, flexible scheduling, freedom to create and execute classes, and freedom to conduct research.

Dimension three (accounting for 15.4% of the variance) represented Treatment by the university as a professional, including salary, feeling valued as a professional, secure or stable employment, and feeling fairly treated.

The fourth dimension, Research, included two items and accounted for 9.9% of the variance: satisfaction with research facilities, and research opportunities. These items could be indicative not of dissatisfaction in conducting research but rather a reflection of limited opportunities because of time and other constraints.

In total, this factor analysis was cleaner, incorporating salary satisfaction into one of the dimensions. (Again, and in addition to the above discussion on salary with regard to its importance in job satisfaction) it could be that salary is a complex concept with regard to its importance in job satisfaction, separate from all criteria measured in this instrument. However, when it comes to a simpler construct, that of satisfaction with salary, it nicely combines with other criteria (feeling valued as a professional and feeling fairly treated) as a fairly tangible way of determining one's level of satisfaction with one's extant situation.

### Gap analysis

Because these two factor analyses loaded similarly for two of their dimensions, gap analysis compared the two (importance and satisfaction dimensions). Here indices were created, determined reliable and valid (based on the factor analysis and Cronbach's reliability analysis).

Using the six identical items of the first dimension for each factor analysis, labeled "Departmental Dyadic and Group Engagement," an additive scale was formed for each (Cronbach Alpha=.85 for importance of job satisfaction items; Cronbach Alpha=.82 for actual level of satisfaction). Difference scores showed a mean difference across these six items for the two dimensions of 3.35.

The second similar dimension in the two factor analyses included the criteria of being fairly treated and being valued, labeled here as Fair Treatment. An additive index showed a correlation of .80 ( $p < .001$ ). The mean gap between the two dimensions on this was 1.41 (s.d.=1.49).

Examining the gap between individual items of perceived importance for job satisfaction and actual satisfaction levels is also revealing, although less robust than the factor analyses.

Here, the widest gaps are noted, and they reveal serious gaps between the importance of fair treatment concerns and perceived satisfaction with fair treatment. Gaps are on a 10-point scale, as they compare two five-point scales but may go in either a positive or negative direction.

The item with the largest gap was job security and stability, with a mean gap of 1.54 (s.d.=1.75). Approximately 85% of respondents indicated this as important to job satisfaction, while 40.7% noted they were dissatisfied with job security and stability. The gap for the importance and satisfaction of feeling one is fairly treated yielded a mean gap of 1.51 (s.d.= 1.59). Looking at these individual items, 95.6% agreed in the importance of feeling one is fairly treated, yet 34.4% expressed dissatisfaction with being fairly treated.

Being valued as a professional's gap had a mean of 1.31 (s.d.=1.61). While 89.8% of the respondents agreed in the importance for being professionally valued, 34.0% reported dissatisfaction related to not being valued as a professional.

The mean gap in salary is 1.10 (s.d. =1.74), keeping in mind that 77.8% of respondents agreed that salary was important to job satisfaction and 38.6% indicated they were dissatisfied with salary.

The gap analysis adds robustness to the items measuring importance and satisfaction, given those with the widest gaps tended to be those with the least satisfaction.

### Related indicators

Respondents were also asked three more questions related to job satisfaction: to identify their overall satisfaction with their position, their sense of their positions as “a temporary solution or a stepping stone to the next phase” of their career, and whether they are “glad [to be] a member of the CSU faculty.”

Most respondents indicated overall satisfaction, with 20.4% strongly agreeing and 41.1% moderately agreeing. There were 11.9% who neither agreed or disagreed, 13.8% who moderately disagreed, 12.1% who strongly disagreed, and less than 1% who either were not sure or indicated that the question was not applicable.

Most respondents do not see their position as a “stepping stone,” as 11.4% moderately disagreed and 29.5% strongly disagreed with that characterization, while 16.4% strongly agreed, 15.9% moderately agreed, and 13.3% neither agreed nor disagreed.

More than 82% indicated they were glad to be a faculty member at CSU.

### III. Hiring and Evaluation

Respondents were reminded in the 2014 survey that in 2013, following the passage of HB1144 by the Colorado General Assembly, the CSU Board of Governors approved the use of contracts of 1-3 years for NTTF while previously NTTF appointments, whether for a specific time period or "without term," were always "at will." Reporting on the terms of their employment at CSU in light of the new legality of contractually binding arrangements, 38.9% reported still functioning on a one-semester or one-year term while 21.2% reported have a without-term appointment, and only 18.8% reported having a contract of 1-3 years in length. 21.2% of 2014 respondents reported not knowing the term or type of their employment. Comparison data to 2009 is incomplete since contracts were not available in 2009. However, since 20% of respondents reported in 2009 that they were unsure of how reappointment occurred, the absence of clarity has remained more or less steady. 43.3% of 2014 respondents report that they have an ongoing, rolling, or multi-year appointment. This is slightly down from 2009 when 42% reported having rolling appointments.

In 2014, just over a quarter (27.6%) of the participants reported that they received a handbook or other written materials to help become acquainted with their department and the position for which they were hired. This question was not asked in 2009.

57.2% of 2014 respondents agree or strongly agree that their job description and/or offer letter provides a clear and accurate explanation of job responsibilities. This is a 2% improvement over 2009.

Another indicator of improvement is that 31.6% of respondents report that they must apply annually to work in their department. This is down from 2009 when 38% of respondents reported that they had to make annual application for a job they currently held.

38.5% of 2014 respondents report understanding the process for rehire in their unit. Comparatively, in 2009 54% reported they understood the process fully. One way to interpret this finding is to say that new levels of awareness around employment practices have drawn attention to points of confusion or lack of clarity/transparency, an awareness that may have been missing in 2009 and have led to exaggerated confidence in hiring processes. Similarly, just fewer than 32% of 2014 respondents believe the process for getting rehired or reappointed is reasonable and fair. In contrast, in 2009, 36% believed the process was reasonable and fair. These findings may again reflect increasing levels of critical awareness of employment practices.

## IV. Employment conditions, recognition, & rewards

While 43.2% of respondents reported they are paid on a per-section basis, 10.2% reported their salary is negotiated as part of a research contract or award. 37.0% indicated they are eligible for promotion and/or merit pay increases; 24.2% reported they are not eligible for promotion and/or merit pay increase; and 26.9% indicated they were unsure whether they qualified for either. While 35.6% reported they believe non tenure-track faculty pay fails to keep pace with tenure-line faculty pay increases, 17.1% moderately or strongly agreed that their salaries keep pace with tenure-line faculty salaries.

74.1% noted they have received clear information about benefits they are eligible for, and 76.0% reported their benefits are equitable to those of other employees. Although 50.4% agreed that they are eligible for leave accrual for cases of childbirth, illness or other exigencies, 29.9% reported they were unsure of their benefits in this regard. Hence, while a majority of respondents showed appreciation of the benefits available to them, there is still a need for additional information about the range of their benefits available to these faculty members.

Responding to questions about the adequacy of office space and resources, 61.3% indicated they have adequate office space, while 24.0% reported they did not agree they had adequate office space. While 74.6% agreed they had access to adequate resources to support teaching or research, 13.9% disagreed with this assessment.

Responding to questions about rewards and recognitions, 55.1% of respondents moderately or strongly agreed with the statement that their departments value their professional expertise and contributions while 25.4% moderately or strongly disagreed.

While 43.7% of respondents stated their belief that tenure-line colleagues respect the contributions of nontenure-track faculty, fully 29.9% moderately or strongly disagreed. In addition, nearly equal numbers, 26.4% and 25.9% respectively, reported that research and teaching awards are/are not available to them. Another 26.8% reported they are unsure whether rewards and recognitions are available to them. While 47.7% said that their titles (instructor, assistant professor on special appointment, etc.) offer meaningful recognition for the work they do, a nearly equal number (30.6%) strongly do not believe that their titles offer meaningful recognition. Over a quarter (26.8%) reported that their college and/or department newsletters do not acknowledge their accomplishments.

Turning to new questions that were posed in the 2014 study, 28.0% of the respondents agreed that their department or college shows that non tenure-track faculty are valued members of the university community. In contrast, 44.0% noted disagreement on this matter.

While 21.4% reported that they agreed their department pays non tenure-track faculty who hold a Ph.D. more than other nontenure-track faculty, 10% noted they disagreed that

nontenure-track faculty who hold a Ph.D. are paid more than other nontenure-track faculty. More than half of the respondents (53.7%) reported they were not sure about this salary difference.

## **V. Representation to faculty governance and perceived administrative support**

Section 5 regards questions relating to opportunities for participation in service and governance as well as perceptions of being welcomed to these efforts. Respondents were evenly divided (19% agreed they were while 25% disagreed) about whether they are adequately represented on Faculty Council. A larger percentage (over 36%) said they were unsure, and another 15% indicated a neutral response. Together these percentages may suggest that a large portion of respondents are unclear about the meaning or relevance of representation. Additionally, one-third (32.5%) indicated they knew who their Faculty Council representative was while 31% indicated they did not know who represented them on Faculty Council.

Regarding being welcomed to participate in governance and committee service at the department level, respondents were evenly divided, which may suggest that the circumstances vary by unit. At the same time, just under 20% indicated they were unsure about levels of departmental welcome, which suggests there is either indifference about this issue or insufficient understanding of what involvement in departmental governance consists of. When asked if their opinion matters at department committee meetings, respondents divided in nearly equal thirds, with just under 1/3 believing their opinion matters, another 1/3 not believing it matters, and the last 1/3 believing their opinion is either not applicable or they are unsure of whether it matters. When asked about feeling included in departmental decision-making on topics that are relevant to the respondent's job responsibilities, nearly half (44.41%) indicated they did not feel included.

Respondents were also queried about rewards for service (serving on committees and participating in other forms of faculty governance) and over one half (53%) indicated they are not rewarded or that reward for service is inapplicable to them. In a pair of follow-on questions, 45% of respondents indicated they would become more involved in service if given the opportunity while 17% said they would not. Additionally, 43% of respondents indicated they would likely become more involved in service if they were rewarded for the effort while only 14% indicated they would not become more involved if rewarded.

A majority (67%) indicated comfort in talking to their department chair about problems or concerns while 13% were neutral in regard to this question, and 16% indicated they did not feel comfortable talking to the Chair.

Respondents were evenly divided as to whether, as a whole, the university administration cares about their interests and situation (31% believed administration does care, 33% believed administration does not care, and 22% were neutral on this question).

## VI. Open-Ended Question

### Qualitative Data Analysis--Open Ended Questions

The final three questions of the survey asked participants to respond to open-ended questions about their experiences and the state of affairs related to their positions as nontenure-track faculty. This section offers an analysis of the qualitative data, illustrating themes among the responses and offering examples of the data to support the themes.

Three Open-Ended Questions were as follows:

- Question 117: At CSU, the major problem facing non tenure-track faculty like myself is?
- Question 118: The way that I would address this problem is.
- Question 119: Any additional comments.

*Number of Responses:*

- 329 respondents offered narrative responses to Question 117
- 307 offered responses to Question 118
- 145 offered responses to Question 119.

#### **Question 117: At CSU, the major problem facing non tenure-track faculty like myself is?**

Of the 487 survey respondents, 329 offered narrative responses to this question. More than 40 themes were noted among these responses. Through further content analysis, the 40 major themes were put into 15 major categories of concern and then grouped into seven major themes. A fuller account of these narrative responses can be viewed in Appendix D.

- **Theme 1: Job Security and Professional Career Trajectory**
- **Theme 2: Lack of a Supportive Culture and Recognition of Contributions (that NTTF were hired to do)**
- **Theme 3: Inadequate and Inconsistent Compensation and Evaluations**
- **Theme 4: Shared Governance and Academic Freedom Issues**
- **Theme 5: Absence of Professional Opportunity, Recognition, and Reward**
- **Theme 6: Inadequate access to Professional Development and Resources to Execute Job Responsibilities**
- **Theme 7: Disregard for Employee's Quality of Life**

Here are some examples of what participants see as the major problems facing NTTF at CSU, which highlight some of the difficulties related to the employment and treatment of NTTF at CSU:

- “As was recently said during a faculty meeting (one of only 3 faculty meetings I have ever been invited to), we are the ‘teaching help’ according to senior tenured faculty. We are not viewed as professionals or colleagues within the organization or our individual unit. Rather, we are simply hired hands meant to keep the teaching

program rolling along and the GTA \$ coming into the department. All prestige, recognition, and awards for the department are expected to go to the only individuals in the department seen as the only important role players – ‘the faculty’ which does not include NTTFs in that definition. The department culture has the ‘faculty’ (regular tenure-track research faculty) and then the ‘teaching help’ (NTTFs). That culture is pervasive and there is no clear recognition of the professional role that full-time, long-term NTTFs play in the overall unit structure.”

- “After 17 years, and being nominated for “teacher of the Year’ .., yearly! I have just been cut [by more than 25%] of my pay due to low enrollment to help save the department \$, with a family of 4 we are now eligible for food stamps. The lack of concern, and security of the university and administration is criminal! I have combined studio course sections to help the department through previous years of budget trouble, I have taken great pride in CSU and this department, combining courses and sections and teaching them concurrently is fine for tenure track, and the pay is not affected, but nontenure-track are not the same type of employees evidently.”
- “Lack of respect! In my department, \_\_, NTTF are treated as second class citizens, with absolutely no respect from other faculty and administrative staff. We are treated as dirt, we feel unwelcome all the time. Our offices are together with graduate students (for most of us), with broken furniture and trash (a few were remodeled recently, but only the carpet and painting changed, broken chairs still abound). We until recently were not allowed to participate in faculty meetings, and we still feel unwelcome in them, so much that most of us don't attend these meetings. Of course we are not allowed to vote in faculty meetings and no one EVER asks for our opinion. Most of the other faculty don't speak to us or acknowledge our presence in faculty meetings or around the department. They don't even say Hi!”
- “Often not certain whether my contribution, in terms of teaching and research, is valued on a department/college level. Does the department feel that research scientists/research associates have an important role? I am not sure.”

### **Theme 1: Job Security and Professional Career Trajectory**

More than 148 of the participants specified that their biggest concern was the lack of a clear career trajectory and job security among the ranks of NTTF. The indications were centered on descriptions of inconsistencies and disparities related to how NTT faculty’s jobs and careers were treated, valued and mentored. Additionally, many responses suggested that there is a lot of confusion about what is possible for promotion or in relation to job security and contracts. Here are some responses from survey participants:

#### *Job instability*

- “Job security [is the major problem facing nontenure-track faculty like myself at CSU]. If our positions were recognized as careers rather than flexible and convenient

solutions for administration's needs, I think we would feel more appreciated, professional, rewarded, and central to our departments.”

- “Fear of job loss. I spent one year in the \_ department and was not rehired for reasons that were never made clear to me. I am now satisfied with my current teaching position, but I do not feel secure about it at all because of my previous experience.”
- “My biggest concern would be the stability of my position if a major change in University funding were to occur. I anticipate that I, despite having been here and performing in ways that ‘exceed expectation,’ would be one of the first ‘to go’ if the department had to start letting people go. This is not because I am not valued but rather that ‘tenured’ faculty have more stable job lines even if they have not been here as long as a non-tenured faculty member.”

*Lack of clear processes or practices related to promotion or a career ladder*

- “Instability of my position. Nothing in place for promotion”

*Unclear job descriptions or confusion about practices related to the employment of faculty off of the tenure track*

- “Holding an administrative position and teaching usually means one does not have recognition in the academic department. One is more than non-tenure; one is simply adjunct and without pay.”

## **Theme 2: Lack of a Supportive Culture and Recognition of Contributions (that were hired to do)**

More than 119 of the Participants indicated their concern and frustration regarding a lack of job description and being hired to do one thing, but then are given several things to do. The main areas of concern regarding emerging from this theme can be summarized by a general sentiment from participants.

*Lack of respect and support from tenured faculty*

- “I am not respected by my younger peers who are tenured (some who were at one time my students), I feel discriminated against on a daily basis because I chose to have children and work part time in order to raise them and finish my PhD, although I now have a PhD and my husband has been tenured for over 25 years there seems to be no opportunity for me to advance at CSU.”

*Feeling undervalued by the department / university*

- “Lack of voice when decisions are made about non-tenure track positions and being at the whim of hidden agenda by tenured faculty members who either believe that these positions are essential or not. The lack of a clear policy for hiring of non-tenure track faculty. The uncertainty of job security. The basic lack of respect by tenured

faculty. A lack of guidance for promotion.”

- “I work in a different building than my main department, which makes me feel isolated; especially when the only time my department head or other administrator stops by is when they have bad news (i.e. funding cuts, space reductions, etc.). Sometimes I wish they would just stop by once-in-a while to touch base with me to see how we are doing and maybe be a little more upbeat about the job we do. I also work in a less glamorous area of science, so that what I do is often ignored or targeted for funding reductions or reduced space allocations. I am also the last person to know what is going on with my facility. I have had to rely on second hand information and gossip to get a clear picture of what is going on. It seems like transparency in information sharing gets down to the department head level and then everyone below that gets ignored.”
- “Not fair treatment and strong inequality of payment; feeling of employment instability; being treated as a ‘second-class’ faculty; arrogance of regular faculty in the Department towards special faculty, which allows regular faculty to create hierarchy and non-democratic environment.”

*University does not recognize that NTT faculty are essential to its teaching mission*

- “We are bearing the majority burden of the teaching load at the university, but receive low pay and temporary, uncertain contracts. I teach some of the largest class sections in my department meaning greater student contact hours. However, my pay is equivalent to those teaching much smaller sections and I have minimal office space for student meetings. I would add that although my contract is part-time, students expect the same level of contact and response that would be given by full-time faculty members.”
- “As a non-research heavy discipline in a research heavy college, we are not always sure we are viewed as equals, also there needs to be more flexibility in the matrix of how faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track) performance is reviewed based on their individual responsibilities and their interactions and professionalism with the department, college and university.”

*Invisibility and isolation of faculty off the tenure track*

- “I can only speak for myself. I was hired at the last minute. I was never supervised, observed, asked how it's going, etc. I was given an Emeritus faculty member's office, full of his stuff. I had to ask the dept. secretary if I would be hired back. My paychecks during the spring semester have not been for the correct amount of money. Yet Tony Frank wants to make CSU a great place for women to work and a great place for adjuncts. You all have a way to go.”

### **Theme 3: Inadequate and Inconsistent Compensation and Evaluations**

Several participants cited the lack of evaluations and being underpaid for the work that they do as a major problem facing CSU and the context of hiring NTTF. More than 200 participants indicated that they are either paid less than colleagues who do the same type of work or are unaware of the evaluation processes that relate to their work. Some people stated that in more than 10 years on the job, they have never been evaluated but are continually concerned about losing their job.

*Poor compensation, raises, summer salary*

- “Salary [is the major problem facing nontenure-track faculty like myself at CSU]. I just earned possibly the only promotion ever available to me, to the STA position, and saw a one-time 5% salary increase. And I'm still making less than an entry-level elementary school educator in the local district. This is unconscionable, given the level of financial commitment in education necessary to apply for an NTTF position on campus--and it makes me feel like a hypocrite for telling my students that the college education I'm helping to provide them is going to be useful toward a middle-income profession.”

“Insufficient pay. I have a Ph.D. and teach the same number of courses as tenure track faculty, yet am NOT compensated as such. Adjunct professors teach many if not most of CSUs courses, yet are not compensated by even half. I am in a small department and we have as many adjunct faculty as tenure track faculty, why should we get paid a quarter of what they get?”

- “It is easy to underpay non tenure-track faculty. We have little job security and no input into departmental policies.”

*Gender disparity – Women outnumber men among the NTTF ranks 3 to 1, but are often paid much less.*

- “A few problems that I have witnessed over my 22 years at CSU in this role: 1. Respect for those on non-tenure track. 2. Pay raises equal to those on tenure track (see note below). 3. Equal pay for women and men. I have been with the university for 22 years and have consistently had superior or exceeds expectations on my annual evaluations. My role is teaching, advising, and service and I have enjoyed my career very much. However, after 22 years on staff, a male was recently hired in our department in the same position (non-tenure, teaching faculty), and was hired at a salary rate of 900.00 dollars more per month than my salary. How is that right? Part of that may be a reflection of our current department head, but it still is not right or just. Very demeaning for one that has dedicated her last 22 years to undergraduate teaching, advising, and community outreach at CSU.”
- “Job security, opportunities for promotion, pay, equity of pay/promotion regardless of gender (in my department, non-tenure instructors/researchers are primarily women), accrual of sick/vacation for 9-month employees”

*Extra work is expected and/or not compensated*

*Having to raise own funding*

*Unclear evaluation and promotion criteria*

- “Apparently random conversion of faculty to tenure track positions. During my time at CSU many special faculty have been converted to tenure track, but the reason for each conversion is different and there is no clear path for faculty to follow if they wish to be considered for a tenure track position. Working hard, teaching, bringing in research grants, serving on committees and performing as well as or better than tenured faculty in the same department bring no reward and no promise of conversion. The only incentive to perform is the threat of losing your job if you don't bring in sufficient research dollars to cover your salary. With current NIH funding being at record lows, this has become virtually impossible as each special research faculty member needs 2 R01s in order to pay their salary and leave enough funds to do the research.”

#### **Theme 4: Shared Governance and Academic Freedom Issues**

*No regulated vote or contribution to discussion on departmental issues, information relevant to one's job, and no influence on curriculum*

- “Adjuncts are perceived to be a necessary evil and not part of the faculty fabric; I've never been invited to a faculty meeting for my department nor asked my opinion about the program, curriculum etc.”

*No voice, no representation at university/college/department levels*

- “Not having a vote on faculty council this is a University Policy that keeps non tenured-track faculty like myself unable to vote on issues that directly affect my position. It would be good to have the ability for Departments to create their own policy that supports their faculty with voting rights.”

*No written guarantee of academic freedom*

There were several examples of academic freedom infringement, e.g., department heads' reprimanding NTT faculty because of students' complaints, no choice on course materials

#### **Theme 5: Absence of Professional Opportunity, Recognition, and Reward**

Examples included mention of no mechanisms for converting to a tenure-track position and inadequate mentoring for the same. Some indicated that nontenure-track faculty make a commitment to CSU but CSU doesn't make a commitment to us.

Comments also noted the following:

- Different colleges/departments do different things with faculty off the tenure track;
- Can't get promoted, few career development opportunities;
- High student contact but this isn't rewarded and it's exhausting;

- Don't qualify for awards in the college.

### **Theme 6: Inadequate access to Professional Development and Resources to Execute Job Responsibilities**

These comments noted a lack of resources and support to do one's job (i.e., training, information & protocol access, paper, printers, computers, software, office supplies, etc.), such as "Do feel like I did not get training or information that would have helped me with things like RamCT, grading, consistency, protocol, etc." Inadequate meeting and office space was also mentioned.

### **Theme 7: Disregard for Employees' Quality of Life and Commitment to the University – This results in NTTF feeling disregarded and invaluable.**

- "Abusing us in terms of workload ('If you don't like it, quit.' 'You're required because it's "other duties as assigned"'), inequitable pay, no contract (just a Letter of Agreement) = INTO CSU, and not accurately assessing us on our contributions: we are NOT 100% teaching, and no long-term contracts."
- "Extremely variable funding and workload levels. Pay goes up & down randomly. Hours are unpredictable and currently require all weekend and every evening just to keep up if I'm paid at 100%, and if hours are reasonable, I'm in danger of losing my benefits due to project lapses. Not very reasonable environment."

## **II. Question 118: The way that I would address this problem is \_\_\_\_.**

Of the 487 survey respondents, 307 offered narrative responses to this question. Thirty-two repeating themes were noted among these responses. These were reduced through content analysis to six major categories of recommendation, given below. Detailed information and direct quotes from survey participants can be read in Appendix D:

*Improve job security, stability, and opportunity*

**Theme 1: Improve Job Security and Stability for faculty off of the Tenure Track**

**Theme 2: Provide a Clear Career Ladder for Faculty off of the Tenure Track (Provide assistance as nontenure-track faculty identify and chart new directions for work and opportunities for change.)**

**Theme 3: Develop Clear and Specific Strategic Plans to Increase Compensation for all NTT Faculty**

**Theme 4: Improve the Culture and the Climate to value all employees and their contributions at CSU with varying appointments and workload responsibilities**

**Theme 5: Increase Shared Governance among faculty and provide options for Nontenure-track Faculty to be involved in Departmental, College, and University**

**Theme 6: Establish Clear and Reasonable Job Descriptions that are relevant and viable.**

## **Theme 7: Increase awareness of varied job descriptions and varied forms/definitions of productivity**

### **Theme 1: Improve Job Security and Provide a Clear Career Ladder for Faculty off of the Tenure Track**

- Establish a consistent and enforced University policy to put Nontenure-track Faculty onto Multi-Year Contracts.
- Create a Career Ladder option for NTT Faculty.
- “3 yr. contracts with rolling renewals as long as performance meets requirements”
- “First, continue the efforts initiated with the new STA to encourage/facilitate longer ‘contracts.’ Create career ladder-type opportunities or promotions within this, including steps pre- and post- STA. Second, create ways to provide some degree of support for research for those in this system whose teaching is strengthened by that form of engagement.”
- “Multi-year contracts would be a good start, but I believe that the best long-term solution would be teaching-only tenure track positions, perhaps partially supported by primarily research faculty who do not wish to teach.”
- “More clear communication about expectations, having a clear understanding of how the system works and how to negotiate our way so that we can without constantly worrying that our position is not funded or that we may not have a job in the future. Having some job protection.”
- “Have a process for special appointments to be become associate, then full professors, even without a tenure track position.”

### **Theme 2: Provide a Clear Career Ladder for Faculty off of the Tenure Track**

- Provide assistance as nontenure-track faculty identify and chart new directions for work and opportunities for change.
- Offer a consistent practice for faculty off of the tenure track to establish a career and develop their professional idea.
- “It would be very helpful if there was a mentor program specifically for nontenure-track personnel for whom we could find out important information relevant to the position and best options for navigating these positions for mutual benefits/success.”

### **Theme 3: Develop Clear and Specific Strategic Plans to Increase Compensation for all NTT Faculty**

- “Even non-tenure staff should be considered for merit bonus or compensation on a scale that recognizes experience, willingness to take on new assignments and effectiveness in the classroom.”

- “Give the same pay raises to nontenure-track faculty as other faculty members. Give non tenure-track faculty more information about the probability of future employment and extended contracts.”
- “Increase salaries, be more inclusive of all CSU employees, offer opportunities for more employees to contribute their voice in decision making.”
- **Reorganization & Policy Clarifications (20)**
  - “Revise the salary scale to reward years of teaching in higher education.”
  - “Don’t stick to the norms- be open minded about new ideas & processes.”
- **Of Communication within Department (10)**
  - “Ensure non-tenure track faculty have a voice at department and college level and rotate those opportunities across the non-tenure track faculty, not exclusively with one faculty member.”

**Theme 4: Improve the culture and the climate at CSU to reflect greater valuing of varied faculty appointments and workload responsibilities**

**Theme 5: Increase shared governance among faculty and provide options for nontenure-track faculty to be involved in department, college, and university governance**

- “If you would consider creating tenure track positions for teaching and still require some professional development for them, it could go a long way in helping them to receive recognition currently denied them the university is extremely hierarchical in nature.”

**Theme 6: Establish clear and reasonable job descriptions that are relevant and viable and increase awareness of varied job descriptions and varied forms/definitions of productivity**

- “What is the role of research associates/scientists? What support does the department/college provide for these positions? What should their compensation be for the time spent on collect/department level activities such as teaching?”
- “Come up with some clear job duties with Dept. head and be mentored by senior faculty.”
- “Streamline and/or describe the promotion/merit process”
- “Keep representing the special appointment faculty in positive ways.”
- “Require longer-term appointment with a number of classes guaranteed.”

**III. Question 119: Any additional comments.**

More than 145 responded to this section to offer advice, gratitude for the their job as well as additional feedback related to what would be helpful in the next phase of improving the working conditions of non-tenure track faculty at CSU.

The primary themes found in response to this question included:

- **Individual Messages of Note**
  - “There are still many people hurting out there in the NTT ranks, especially women. “
  - “Survive by keeping your head down.”
  - “The responsibilities of NTTF are the cast-off functions. We do things the tenure-track faculty don’t want to do. They are sending us all their students and classes.”
  - “Candor about conditions is dangerous. Dissent is dangerous.”
  - Someone still on the list who has left said: “Finding the courage to leave was the best thing I ever did.”
  
- **Career-valuing needed—forms: career trajectory, recognitions, support and compensation, recognition of initiative.**
  - 5 Salaries remain unacceptable and reflect devaluation of teaching; it’s only a living wage if NTTF member is part of a dual-income family. Inequities in pay across campus are “outrageous.”
  - 3--Seeking a conversion model that’s regularized across campus
  - 2--Value teaching by valuing teachers
  - 2--Teaching tenure needed; research professor track needed
  - 2—Consistent use of mentors needed
  - 2--Find recognitions—some locations disallow NTTF participation in awards altogether: “My work is not known to my dept. or the U, much less acknowledged for its value.” “Give students more ways to recognize great teaching.” “Revise the reliance on course evaluation surveys.”
  - 2--There remains an absence of meaningful evaluation or observation of teaching.
  - 2--Career trajectory needed for NTTF. Also for a parallel track as research professor: “Being a permanent assistant professor affects my ability to compete for the funding I must have to continue my position.”
  - 2--Online teacher need same hiring mechanisms, promotion opportunities (to STA) and conditions as RI
  - Supplemental pay needs to be not be capped for NTTF
  - Count work outside workload distribution if it’s connected to role and contributes to professional stature of individual and program
  - Clarify how APs and NTTF can give back and become more involved and meaningfully integrated
  - Annual application and rehire remains the norm in some locations.
  - Feels discriminated against due to age and gender. Displacement recently due to new TT hire.

- **Regularize Appointments and Roles: communicate university intentions as EXPECTATIONS for dept. chairs and deans—hold them accountable and have metrics for their performance in this regard.**
  - 3--Get message to dept. chairs and deans about the university's intentions—best laid plans have offered little improvement since last survey
  - 2--Pulling the rug—don't mentor, develop, and then dismiss. Be consistent and be fair. People move here to take a job and then are jobless a year later.
  - 2--Increasing AP role in teaching—what is the policy?
  - Regularize policies and appointments –for instance enrollments for class to “make” vary and create unfairness when some classes are cancelled at a low enrollment number while others are allowed to move forward at the same number
  - Tenuous hiring future needs to be spelled out before people move here
  - Social Security and PERA should be the standard; DCP is not equivalent. Is it a legal and ethical alternative?
  - Contracts need to be consistently offered across campus for some sense of commitment, longevity
  - Professional development and travel monies needed for ongoing professionalization of NTTF
- **Participation in Governance is Uneven**
  - Voting rights exclude personnel and curriculum so most time excluded from voting, even where “invited” to be part of governance
  - Integrate NTTF into departmental culture—still not happening
- **Specific locations pointed out**
  - INTO is messed up. One person's reports being “resigned to poor business model and overwork. Slave labor in a corporate setting.” Contract faculty not hired at base rate so tiers of NTTF exploited. Message sent that “If you don't like it, leave.” Leave policies never explained. General culture of allowing a pattern of abuse of NTTF.
  - Business College does not have recognitions for NTTF

## VII. Comparison with 2009 results

### The 2009 Study

The 2009 data were analyzed to determine how they compared on the importance of various job criteria to job satisfaction and actual job satisfaction items. It should be noted that the 2014 survey included items about job stability that were not included in the 2009

survey, although all the other items were identical. Thus, the factor analyses reported here are not 100% identical.

### **Importance of various job criteria to job satisfaction**

A factor analysis, conducted in an identical manner as the data analyses above, yielded five factors, or dimensions, of the concept of the importance of various characteristics of job satisfaction, accounting for 62.2% of the variance.

The first dimension, labeled Job Focus Importance, comprised the importance of not having student contact, not having the freedom to create and deliver classes, having the freedom to conduct research, having excellent research facilities, having research opportunities. This dimension accounted for 25.7% of the variance, suggesting a strong dimension.

The second dimension in the 2009 survey items on the importance of job satisfaction criteria, labeled here as Colleague Importance, and accounting for 15.0% of the variance, included the items working collaboratively, contact with colleagues and enjoying collegiality.

The third dimension on importance of job satisfaction items, labeled here as Departmental Importance, accounted for 8.2% of the variance and included salary, being involved in departmental activities, obtaining professional development, and being involved in departmental governance.

Feeling valued as a professional, being intellectually stimulated and being fairly treated, labeled here as Professional Respect, comprised the fourth dimension in the 2009 survey. This dimension added an additional 7.0% of the variance to the factor analysis results.

For the last, or fifth, dimension, labeled here as Choices, accounted for 6.3% of the variance and included the items autonomy, academic freedom and having a flexible schedule.

### **Job Satisfaction**

The factor analysis yielded five dimensions, accounting for 63.9% of the variance in this umbrella construct.

The first dimension, accounting for 29.5% of the variance and labeled Colleague Satisfaction, included the following items measuring job satisfaction: contact with colleagues, working collaboratively, and enjoying collegiality.

The second dimension, Research Satisfaction, which accounted for 14.5% of the variance, showed the following items as important for job satisfaction: freedom to conduct research, excellent research opportunities, and excellent research facilities.

Accounting for 8.1% of the variance, the third dimension of the factor analysis included Professional Growth items of being mentored, professional development opportunities, being included in departmental activities, and being involved in departmental governance.

The fourth dimension, labeled Choice Satisfaction, included student contact, autonomy, flexible schedule, and creating and executing classes. This accounted for 6.6% of the variance.

Lastly, the fifth dimension accounted for 5.3% of the variance. Labeled as Respect Satisfaction, this dimension included salary, feeling valued as a professional, and being fairly treated.

The third dimensions of importance of job satisfaction criteria and of actual job satisfaction were almost identical, except salary loaded onto the importance dimension, which creates a serious distinction between these two factor analyses. Salary figured in as quite important in one's determining job satisfaction, given its importance as part of departmental involvement and professional growth. However, when it came down to actual job satisfaction, salary wasn't part of this dimension, and it loaded with the Professional Respect (fifth) Satisfaction dimension.

The fourth dimension, Choice Satisfaction, yielded mixed results with the importance factor analysis.

The fifth dimension was similar to the fourth dimension of importance of job satisfaction criteria, with the addition of salary. The clustering of these items that clearly represent professional respect, tangible and intangible, on a satisfaction dimension is quite telling.

### Comparing 2009 and 2014 factor analyses

It's interesting that the strongest first dimension of the importance construct combined the key items of the second and third dimension manifested in the 2014 survey, but with two key differences. The 2009 survey results suggest student contact and academic freedom are important, but in the opposite manner in which the research freedom, opportunities, and facilities are important. In the 2014 survey, the Job Focus Importance equivalent items also factored along with items representing being valued and treated fairly, items that separate out into their own dimension in the 2009 results. It could be that actual changes in professional treatment and value, or perceptions thereof, devalued in importance between the 2009 and 2014 surveys, manifesting in their own, separate dimension in 2014. It is possible more attention to these aspects of being a nontenure-track faculty fostered a stronger dimension in and of itself in the 2014 survey data. Besides the continuing increase in nontenure-track faculty and apparent disparities between tenure and nontenure-track faculty, representatives of the nontenure-track faculty have brought issues to the Colorado State University administration, which has led to attention by the administrators, some changes in salary and contracts, and more information on the status of nontenure-track

faculty in news media. These time-period influences likely had some impact on the noted changes in the dimensions of these factors over this five-year period.

The second dimension of 2009 data contained two of the items in the first dimension of the 2014 survey, and then one from the third dimension. Clearly, these items are important, but the breakdown seems a little neater, and clearer, in the 2009 survey results. It is impossible to compare such divergent dimensions.

Regarding the third dimension, in 2009, being a part of the department in terms of involvement and governance clustered with less importance than in 2014. This suggests perhaps these characteristics of a satisfying job have become more salient, relevant, and perhaps more possible in 2014. The fact that salary is separated out so dramatically, and is the fifth dimension of importance in 2014, shows some powerful change in perceptions about the importance of salary, possibly with some changes in actual salary gain (or loss) over this time period.

As far as the fourth dimension, two the three items factored on the third dimension in the 2014 results, which also combined student contact items.

Dimension three of the 2014 is identical to dimension 5 of the 2009 study, suggesting the items that determine respect on the job, tangible and intangible rewards of the job, have been significant and may be growing in significance relative to job satisfaction.

So far as the job satisfaction analyses, the first dimension of job satisfaction, Colleague Satisfaction, included the same items as the second dimension of the importance of job satisfaction criteria items, Colleague Importance.

The second dimension captured items that were represented in the first dimension of the importance factors, Student Orientation.

### Gap Analysis for 2009 survey

Because the factors did not match well in the 2009 and 2014 studies, individual items were analyzed regarding gaps between importance of job criteria and job satisfaction. Following this, some comparison may be made between the gaps between importance of specific job satisfaction criteria and actual perceived job satisfaction for the specific items across these two surveys.

Interestingly, the item with the largest gap found in the 2014 survey, job security and stability, was not included in the 2009 study.

The largest gap for individual items in 2009 was found between being fairly treated, with the mean gap of 1.45 (s.d.=1.59) between the importance of being fairly treated as a criterion in determining one's job satisfaction and one's actual perceived job satisfaction relative to being treated fairly. While 95.6% of the respondents agreed that being treated fairly was an

important component of job satisfaction, 49.1% indicated satisfaction and 34.6% expressed dissatisfaction on being treated fairly.

Feeling valued as a professional showed the second largest gap, with a mean gap score of 1.40 (s.d. = 1.58). Here, 89.8% of the respondents agreed with the importance of feeling valued as a professional. While 47% agreed that they were satisfied with their level of being valued as a professional, 34.0% showed dissatisfaction on this criterion.

The mean gap for salary, 1.04 (s.d. = 1.65) was the third largest gap between importance of job criteria and job satisfaction. While 77.8% indicated the importance of salary, 45.4% showed satisfaction and 38.7% showed dissatisfaction in salary.

It is critical to note that the patterns of these three individual gaps are replicated in the 2014 survey, with the addition of the gap for security/stability in the job.

## Appendices

The following appendices are attached to this report:

Appendix A: The Survey Questions

Appendix B: The Survey in Aggregate Form, Narrative Responses Removed

Appendix C: The Disaggregated Survey Results, by College

Appendix D: Excerpted Responses to Open-Ended Questions 117, 118, and 119

## Appendix A—The Survey Questions

### Survey of Non-tenure-track Faculty (NTTF) at CSU

**Introduction:** You have been identified as a member of the non tenure-track faculty (NTTF) at Colorado State University. The Center for the Study of Academic Labor at CSU is conducting this survey to inform all who are concerned with improving working conditions for non-tenure track faculty at the university. In support of this goal, we have created the following survey, which we believe will take about 15 minutes to complete. Your participation will provide essential information that can guide the administration, Faculty Council, and others in attending to the working conditions of NTTF.

Do you have a non-tenure track appointment with primary teaching responsibility for one or more courses at CSU? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Do you have a non-tenure-track appointment with primarily research responsibilities? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Do you have a non-tenure-track appointment with primarily clinical responsibilities? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Do you have a joint administrative professional-faculty appointment? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If you answered yes to one of the above questions, please continue with this survey.

If you answered “No” to all of the above questions, please describe your primary responsibility at CSU.

#### Part I. Demographics and Employment Classification

##### College

- \_\_\_ College of Agricultural Sciences
- \_\_\_ College of Applied Human Sciences
- \_\_\_ College of Business
- \_\_\_ College of Engineering
- \_\_\_ College of Liberal Arts
- \_\_\_ Warner College of Natural Resources
- \_\_\_ College of Natural Sciences
- \_\_\_ College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences

Years of Employment at CSU \_\_\_\_\_

##### Gender

- F
- M
- T

### **Ethnicity/Citizenship**

- Asian American
- African American
- European American
- Hispanic American
- Native American
- International—not a U.S. Citizen
- Other

### **Employment Term**

In 2013, following the passage of HB1144 by the Colorado General Assembly, the CSU Board of Governors approved the use of contracts of 1-3 years for NTTF. Previously, NTTF appointments, whether for a specific time period or “without term,” were always “at will.” What are the terms of your employment at CSU?

- I have a one-semester or one year term
- I have a without-term appointment
- I have a contract for 1-3 years
- I do not know the term of my employment

### **CSU Employment Category [Choose one]**

- Senior Teaching Appointment Faculty  
If you hold a Senior Teaching faculty appointment, what is your academic rank?
  - Instructor
  - Assistant Professor
  - Associate Professor
  - Full Professor
  - I don't know
  
- Special Appointment Faculty  
If you hold a Special faculty appointment, what is your academic rank?
  - Instructor
  - Assistant Professor
  - Associate Professor
  - Full Professor
  - I don't know
  
- Temporary Appointment Faculty  
If you hold a Temporary faculty appointment, what is your academic rank?
  - Instructor

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor
- I don't know

Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA)

Administrative Professional (If you check this employment category, please continue with questions A, B, & C.)

A. If you are an Administrative Professional, what is your appointment type?

- Regular
- Special (research funded)
- Other
- I don't know

B. If you are an Administrative Professional, what is your appointment category?

- Research Associate (I-IV)
- Research Scientist
- Senior Research Scientist
- Other (Coordinator, Administrator, etc.)
- I don't know

C. Do you have a Joint-Administrative Professional Faculty appointment in an academic department?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

If yes, in what department(s): \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, what is your academic rank?

- Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor
- I don't know

If no, in which unit is your appointment: \_\_\_\_\_

## Part II. General Information about Your Work

Please indicate the percentage of your position that is involved with teaching and research:

Teaching \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Research \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 Service \_\_\_\_\_ %

Do you have other responsibilities beyond teaching and/or research and/or service?

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If "Yes," describe your other responsibility(ies).\_\_\_\_\_

If you teach, how many classes do you typically teach per semester ?

1 2 3 4 5 6 >6

If you teach, how many students do you have in all of your classes combined in an average semester?

\_\_\_Under 30 \_\_\_30-49 \_\_\_50-100 \_\_\_100-500 \_\_\_>500

If you teach, do you teach courses that are delivered completely online?

Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_

If you teach courses online, does your compensation differ for teaching online than you would for teaching a residential instruction (RI) class?

\_\_\_Yes, I receive *more* compensation for teaching online courses

\_\_\_Yes, I receive *less* compensation for teaching online courses

\_\_\_Yes, but whether I receive more or less compensation for teaching online courses than RI depends on enrollment in the online course

\_\_\_No, I receive the same compensation whether I teach an online or RI course

If your primary responsibility is research but you also teach, do you receive additional compensation for teaching classes?

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

When you were hired, did you receive a handbook or other written materials to help you become acquainted with your department and your position outside the tenure system?

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

**How important are the following to your job satisfaction? Please circle one in each row.**

*Rate the following from 5 (very satisfied) to 1 (unsatisfied). NA means not applicable.*

Salary	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Student Contact	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Contact with colleagues	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Autonomy	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Working collaboratively	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Having a flexible schedule	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Having freedom to create/execute classes	5	4	3	2	1	NA
Having freedom to conduct research		5	4	3	2	1 NA
Feeling valued as a professional	5	4	3	2	1	NA

Having excellent research facilities	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Having excellent research opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Being mentored	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Obtaining professional development		5	4	3	2	1	NA
Being involved in department activities	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Being involved in department governance	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Being intellectually stimulated	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Enjoying collegiality	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Feeling fairly treated		5	4	3	2	1	NA
Exercising academic freedom	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Secure or stable employment		5	4	3	2	1	NA

**With respect to your professional position at CSU, how satisfied are you with the following? Please circle one in each row:**

*Rate the following from 5 (very satisfied) to 1 (unsatisfied). NA means not applicable.*

Salary	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Student Contact	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Contact with colleagues	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Autonomy	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Working collaboratively	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Having a flexible schedule	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Having freedom to create/execute classes	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Having freedom to conduct research		5	4	3	2	1	NA
Feeling valued as a professional	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Having excellent research facilities	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Having excellent research opportunities	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Being mentored	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Obtaining professional development		5	4	3	2	1	NA
Being involved in department activities	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Being involved in department governance	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Being intellectually stimulated	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Enjoying collegiality	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Feeling fairly treated	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Exercising academic freedom	5	4	3	2	1	NA	
Secure or stable employment		5	4	3	2	1	NA

**Part III Hiring & Evaluation, Rewards & Recognitions, Compensation, Governance, Grievance.**

**Please circle one after each statement:**

*Rate the following from 5 (definitely true) to 1 (definitely untrue). NA means not applicable.*

My job description and/or offer letter provided at the time of my hire clearly and accurately explained my job responsibilities.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I must apply annually to work in my department.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I understand the process for getting rehired or reappointed.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

The process for getting rehired/reappointed is reasonable.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

The process for getting rehired/reappointed is fair.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I have adequate office space.                    5    4    3    2    1    NA

I have access to adequate resources (e.g., supplies, copying, etc.) to support my teaching or research.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I have an ongoing, rolling, or multi-year appointment for which I need not apply annually.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am paid on a "per section" basis.    5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am paid a salary that has been negotiated as part of a research contract or research award.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I know how my effort (research, teaching, service) is distributed on the annual evaluation.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My effort distribution correctly reflects my work responsibilities.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I would switch to a standard tenure-track position, including an effort distribution that includes teaching, research and service, if that were possible.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I would switch to a teaching-only tenure-track position if that were possible.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I would switch to a research-only tenure-track position if that were possible.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My job performance is evaluated annually.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

Evaluation criteria accurately reflect my responsibilities and accomplishments.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am able to see the student evaluations of my teaching.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My job performance is accurately assessed in my annual evaluation.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am eligible for promotion and/or merit pay increases.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

Research and/or teaching awards are available to provide recognition for the work I do.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My title (e.g. instructor, assistant professor on special appointment, senior teaching appointment, etc.) provides meaningful recognition for the work I do.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My department and/or college newsletters recognize people in non-tenure-track positions.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My department values my professional expertise and contributions.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My department and/or college has developed good ways of showing that non-tenure-track faculty are valued members of the university community.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I have academic freedom.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I fear that my job may be threatened by possible budget, enrollment, or funding fluctuations.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I believe that my department and college are doing everything they can to save my position in the face of possible enrollment, or funding fluctuations.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I believe that university administrators are working to save my position in the face of possible enrollment, or funding fluctuations.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

In general, the tenured and tenure-track faculty in my department respect my contributions.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My pay has risen along with that of the tenured and tenure-track faculty in my department.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My department pays non-tenure-track faculty who hold a Ph.D. more than other non-tenure-track faculty.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I receive clear information about benefits.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am eligible for benefits like those of other employees.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am eligible for leave accrual in the case of childbirth, illness, or other exigencies.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

The university administration cares about my interests and situation.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am adequately represented by Faculty Council.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I know who my Faculty Council representatives are or I know how to find out.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I feel welcome at departmental faculty meetings.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

My opinion matters at faculty committee meetings.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I feel included in departmental decision-making about topics that are relevant to my job responsibilities.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I am rewarded for serving on committees and participating in other forms of faculty governance.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I would become more involved in committees and faculty governance if I were invited and welcome to participate.

5    4    3    2    1    NA

I would become more involved in committees and faculty governance if I were knew my efforts would be rewarded.

5      4      3      2      1      NA

I feel comfortable talking to my department chair if I have a problem or concern.

5      4      3      2      1      NA

Overall, I feel satisfied with my current position at CSU.

5      4      3      2      1      NA

Overall, I consider my non-tenure-track position to be a temporary solution or a stepping stone to the next phase of my career.

5      4      3      2      1      NA

I am glad that I am a member of the CSU faculty.

5      4      3      2      1      NA

#### **Part IV. Open-Ended Feedback**

At CSU, the major problem facing non tenure-track faculty like myself is:

The way I would address this problem is:

Any additional Comments:

## Appendix B

## Appendix C

## Appendix D—Excerpts from Qualitative Responses

### Qualitative Data Analysis

The final three questions of the survey asked participants to respond to open-ended questions about their experiences and the state of affairs related to their positions as non-tenure-track faculty. This section offers an analysis of the qualitative data, illustrating themes among the responses and offering examples of the data to support the themes.

*Three Open-Ended Questions were as follows:*

- *Question 117: At CSU, the major problem facing non tenure-track faculty like myself is?*
- *Question 118: The way that I would address this problem is.*
- *Question 119: Any additional comments.*

*Number of Responses:*

- 329 respondents offered narrative responses to Questions 117
- 307 offered responses to Question 118
- 145 offered responses to Question 119.

#### *I. Question 117: At CSU, the major problem facing non tenure-track faculty like myself is?*

*Of the 487 survey respondents, 329 offered narrative responses to this question. More than 40 themes were noted among these responses. Through further content analysis, the 40 major themes were put into 15 major categories of concern and then grouped into seven major themes. A fuller account of these narrative responses can be viewed in Appendix \_.*

- **Theme 1: Job Security and Professional Career Trajectory**
- **Theme 2: Lack of a Supportive Culture and Recognition of Contributions (that were hired to do)**
- **Theme 3: Inadequate and Inconsistent Compensation and Evaluations**
- **Theme 4: Shared Governance and Academic Freedom Issues**
- **Theme 5: Absence of Professional Opportunity, Recognition, and Reward**
- **Theme 6: Inadequate access to Professional Development and Resources to Execute Job Responsibilities**
- **Theme 7: Disregard for Employee's Quality of Life**

Here are some examples of about what participants see as the major problems facing NTT faculty at CSU and highlights some of the more difficulties related to the employment and treatment of NTT faculty at CSU:

“As was recently said during a faculty meeting (one of only 3 faculty meetings I have ever been invited to), we are the "teaching help" according to senior tenured faculty. We are not viewed as professionals or colleagues within the organization or our individual unit. Rather, we are simply hired hands meant to keep the teaching program rolling along and the GTA \$ coming into the department. All prestige, recognition, and awards for the department are expected to go to the only individuals in the department seen as the only important role

players - "the faculty" which does not include NTTFs in that definition. The department culture has the "faculty" (regular tenure-track research faculty) and then the "teaching help" (NTTFs). That culture is pervasive and there is no clear recognition of the professional role that full-time, long-term NTTFs play in the overall unit structure."

"After 17 years, and being nominated for "teacher of the Year" ..., yearly ! I have just been cut [by more than 25%] of my pay due to low enrollment to help save the department \$, with a family of 4 we are now eligible for food stamps. the lack of concern, and security of the university and administration is criminal!, I have combined studio course sections to help the department through previous years of budget trouble, I have taken great pride in CSU and this department, combining courses and sections and teaching them concurrently is fine for tenure track, and the pay is not affected, but non-tenure-track are not the same type of employees evidently."

"Lack of respect! In my department, \_\_ , NTTF are treated as second class citizens, with absolutely no respect from other faculty and administrative staff. We are treated as dirt, we feel unwelcome all the time. Our offices are together with graduate students (for most of us), with broken furniture and trash (a few were remodeled recently, but only the carpet and painting changed, broken chairs still abound). We until recently were not allowed to participate in faculty meetings, and we still feel unwelcome in them, so much that most of us don't attend these meetings. Of course we are not allowed to vote in faculty meetings and no one EVER asks for our opinion. Most of the other faculty don't speak to us or acknowledge our presence in faculty meetings or around the department. They don't even say Hi!"

"Often not certain whether my contribution, in terms of teaching and research, is valued on a department/college level. Does the department feel that research scientists/research associates have an important role? I am not sure."

### **Theme 1: Job Security and Professional Career Trajectory**

More than 148 of the participants specified that their biggest concern was the lack of a clear career trajectory and job security among the ranks of non-tenured faculty. The indications were centered on descriptions of inconsistencies and disparities related to how NTT faculty's jobs and careers were treated, valued and mentored. Additionally, many responses suggested that there is a lot of confusion about what is possible for promotion or in relation to job security and contracts. Here are some responses from survey participants:

#### **1. Job instability**

"Job security [is the major problem facing non-tenure-track faculty like myself at CSU]. If our positions were recognized as careers rather than flexible and convenient solutions for administration's needs, I think we would feel more appreciated, professional, rewarded, and central to our departments."

"Fear of job loss. I spent one year in the \_ department and was not rehired for reasons that were never made clear to me. I am now satisfied with my current

teaching position, but I do not feel secure about it at all because of my previous experience.”

“My biggest concern would be the stability of my position if a major change in University funding were to occur. I anticipate that I, despite having been here and performing in ways that "exceed expectation", would be one of the first "to go" if the department had to start letting people go. This is not because I am not valued but rather that "tenured" faculty have more stable job lines even if they have not been here as long as a non-tenured faculty member.”

**2. Lack of clear processes or practices related to promotion or a career ladder**

“Instability of my position Nothing in place for promotion”

**3. Unclear job descriptions or confusion about practices related to the employment of faculty off of the tenure track**

“Holding an administrative position and teaching usually means one does not have recognition in the academic department. One is more than non-tenure; one is simply adjunct and without pay.”

**4. Lack of contracts and**

**Theme 2: Lack of a Supportive Culture and Recognition of Contributions (that were hired to do)**

More than 119 of the Participants indicated their concern and frustration regarding a lack of job description and being hired to do one thing, but then are given several things to do. The main areas of concern regarding emerging from this them can be summarized by a general sentiment from participants:

**1. Lack of respect and support from tenured faculty**

“I am not respected by my younger peers who are tenured (some who were at one time my students), I feel discriminated against on a daily basis because I chose to have children and work part time in order to raise them and finish my PhD, although I now have a PhD and my husband has been tenured for over 25 years there seems to be no opportunity for me to advance at CSU.”

**2. Feeling undervalued by the department/university**

“Lack of voice when decisions are made about non-tenure track positions and being at the whim of hidden agenda by tenured faculty members who either believe that these positions are essential or not. The lack of a clear policy for hiring of non-tenure track faculty. The uncertainty of job security. The basic lack of respect by tenured faculty. A lack of guidance for promotion.”

“I work in a different building than my main department, which makes me feel isolated, especially when the only time my department head or other administrator stops by is when they have bad news (i.e funding cuts, space reductions, etc). Sometimes I wish they would just stop by once-in-a while to touch base with me to see how we are doing and maybe be a little more upbeat about the job we do. I also

work in a less glamorous area of science, so that what I do is often ignored or targeted for funding reductions or reduced space allocations. I am also the last person to know what is going on with my facility. I have had to rely on second hand information and gossip to get a clear picture of what is going on. It seems like transparency in information sharing gets down to the department head level and then everyone below that gets ignored.”

“Not fair treatment and strong inequality of payment; feeling of employment instability; being treated as a "second-class" faculty; arrogance of regular faculty in the Department towards special faculty, which allows regular faculty to create hierarchy and non-democratic environment.”

### **3. University does not recognize that NTT faculty are essential to its teaching mission**

“We are bearing the majority burden of the teaching load at the university, but receive low pay and temporary, uncertain contracts. I teach some of the largest class sections in my department meaning greater student contact hours. However, my pay is equivalent to those teaching much smaller sections and I have minimal office space for student meetings. I would add that although my contract is part-time, students expect the same level of contact and response that would be given by full-time faculty members.”

“As a non-research heavy discipline in a research heavy college, we are not always sure we are viewed as equals, also there needs to be more flexibility in the matrix of how faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track) performance is reviewed based on their individual responsibilities and their interactions and professionalism with the department, college and university.”

### **4. Invisibility and isolation of faculty off the tenure track**

“I can only speak for myself. I was hired at the last minute. I was never supervised, observed, asked how it's going, etc. I was given an Emeritus faculty member's office, full of his stuff. I had to ask the dept. secretary if I would be hired back. My paychecks during the spring semester have not been for the correct amount of money. Yet Tony Frank wants to make CSU a great place for women to work and a great place for adjuncts. You all have a way to go.”

## **Theme 3: Inadequate and Inconsistent Compensation and Evaluations**

Several participants cited the lack of evaluations and being underpaid for the work that they do as a major problem facing CSU and the context of hiring NTT faculty. More than 200 participants indicated that they are either paid less than colleagues who do the same type of work or are unaware of the evaluation processes that relate their work. Some people stated that in more than 10 years on the job, they have never been evaluated but are continually concerned about losing their job:

### **1. Poor compensation, raises, summer salary**

“Salary [is the major problem facing non-tenure-track faculty like myself at CSU]. I just earned possibly the only promotion ever available to me, to the STA position, and saw a one-time 5% salary increase. And I'm still making less than an entry-level elementary school educator in the local district. This is unconscionable, given the level of financial commitment in education necessary to apply for an NTTTF position on campus--and it makes me feel like a hypocrite for telling my students that the college education I'm helping to provide them is going to be useful toward a middle-income profession.”

“Insufficient pay. I have a Ph.D. and teach the same number of courses as tenure track faculty, yet am NOT compensated as such. Adjunct professors teach many if not most of CSUs courses, yet are not compensated by even half. I am in a small department and we have as many adjunct faculty as tenure track faculty, why should we get paid a quarter of what they get?”

“It is easy to underpay non tenure-track faculty. We have little job security and no input into departmental policies.”

**2. Gender disparity – Women outnumber men among the NTT faculty ranks 3 to 1, but are often paid much less:**

“A few problems that I have witnesses over my 22 years at CSU in this role: 1. Respect for those on non-tenure track. 2. Pay raises equal to those on tenure track (see note below). 3. Equal pay for women and men. I have been with the university for 22 years and have consistently had superior or exceeds expectations on my annual evaluations. My role is teaching, advising, and service and I have enjoyed my career very much. However, after 22 years on staff, a male was recently hired in our department in the same position (non-tenure, teaching faculty), and was hired at a salary rate of 900.00 dollars more per month than my salary. How is that right? Part of that may be a reflection of our current department head, but it still is not right or just. Very demeaning for one that has dedicated her last 22 years to undergraduate teaching, advising, and community outreach at CSU.”

“Job security, opportunities for promotion, pay, equity of pay/promotion regardless of gender (in my department, non-tenure instructors/researchers are primarily women), accrual of sick/vacation for 9-month employees”

**3. Extra work is expected and/or not compensated**

**4. Having to raise own funding**

**5. Unclear evaluation and promotion criteria**

“Apparently random conversion of faculty to tenure track positions. During my time at CSU many special faculty have been converted to tenure track, but the reason for each conversion is different and there is no clear path for faculty to follow if they wish to be considered for a tenure track position. Working hard, teaching, bringing in research grants, serving on committees and performing as well as or better than tenured faculty in the same department bring no reward and no promise of conversion. The only incentive to perform is the threat of losing your job if you don't bring in sufficient research dollars to cover your salary. With current NIH funding

being at record lows, this has become virtually impossible as each special research faculty member needs 2 R01s in order to pay their salary and leave enough funds to do the research.”

#### **Theme 4: Shared Governance and Academic Freedom Issues**

**1. No regulated vote or contribution to discussion on Departmental issues, information relevant to ones' job, and no influence on**

“adjuncts are perceived to be a necessary evil and not part of the faculty fabric; I've never been invited to a faculty meeting for my department nor asked my opinion about the program, curriculum etc.”

**2. no voice, no representation at University/College/Department levels**

“Not having a vote on faculty council this is a University Policy that keeps non tenured-track faculty like myself unable to vote on issues that directly affect my position. It would be good to have the ability for Departments to create their own policy that supports their faculty with voting rights.”

**3. No written guarantee of academic freedom**

**4. Several examples of academic freedom infringement (e.g., Department Heads' reprimanding NTT faculty because of students' complaints, no choice on course materials)**

#### **Theme 5: Absence of Professional Opportunity, Recognition, and Reward**

No mechanisms for converting to a tenure-track position and inadequate mentoring for the same

Non-tenure-track faculty make a commitment to CSU but CSU doesn't make a commitment to us.

1. Different colleges/departments do different things with faculty off the tenure track
2. Can't get promoted, few career development opportunities
3. High student contact but this isn't rewarded and it's exhausting
4. Don't qualify for awards in the college

#### **Theme 6: Inadequate access to Professional Development and Resources to Execute Job Responsibilities**

**1. Lack of resources and support to do one's job (i.e., training, information & protocol access, paper, printers, computers, software, office supplies, etc.)**

“Do feel like I did not get training or information that would have helped me with things like RamCT, grading, consistency, protocol, etc.”

**2. Inadequate meeting and office space**

#### **Theme 7: Disregard for Employees' Quality of Life and Commitment to the University – resulting in feeling disregarded and invaluable**

“Abusing us in terms of workload ("If you don't like it, quit." "You're required because it's 'other duties as assigned"), inequitable pay, no contract (just a Letter of Agreement) =INTO CSU, and not accurately assessing us on our contributions: we are NOT 100% teaching, and no long-term contracts.”

“Extremely variable funding and workload levels. Pay goes up & down randomly. Hours are unpredictable and currently require all weekend and every evening just to keep up if I'm paid at 100%, and if hours are reasonable, I'm in danger of losing my benefits due to project lapses. Not very reasonable environment.”

## *II. Question 118: The way that I would address this problem is.*

*Of the 487 survey respondents, 307 offered narrative responses to this question. 32 repeating themes were noted among these responses. These were reduced through content analysis to six major categories of recommendation, given below. Detailed information and direct quotes from survey participants can be read in Appendix \_:*

### *Improve job security, stability, and opportunity*

- **Theme 1: Improve Job Security and Stability for faculty off of the Tenure Track**
- **Theme 2: Provide a Clear Career Ladder for Faculty off of the Tenure Track (Provide assistance as non-tenure-track faculty identify and chart new directions for work and opportunities for change.)**
- **Theme 3: Develop Clear and Specific Strategic Plans to Increase Compensation for all NTT Faculty**
- **Theme 4: Improve the Culture and the Climate to value all employees and their contributions at CSU with varying appointments and workload responsibilities**
- **Theme 5: Increase Shared Governance among faculty and provide options for Non-Tenure-track Faculty to be involved in Departmental, College, and University**
- **Theme 6: Establish Clear and Reasonable Job Descriptions that are relevant and viable.**
- **Theme 7: Increase awareness of varied job descriptions and varied forms/definitions of productivity**

### **Theme 1: Improve Job Security and Provide a Clear Career Ladder for Faculty off of the Tenure Track**

- a. Establish a consistent and enforced University policy to put Non-Tenure-Track Faculty onto Multi-Year Contracts
- b. Create a Career Ladder option for NTT Faculty
  - “3 yr. contracts with rolling renewals as long as performance meets requirements”
  - “First, continue the efforts initiated with the new STA to encourage/facilitate longer “contracts”. Create career ladder-type opportunities or promotions within this, including steps pre- and post- STA. Second, create ways to provide some degree of support for research for those in this system whose teaching is strengthened by that form of engagement.”

“Multi-year contracts would be a good start, but I believe that the best long-term solution would be teaching-only tenure track positions, perhaps partially supported by primarily research faculty who do not wish to teach.”

“More clear communication about expectations, having a clear understanding of how the system works and how to negotiate our way so that we can without constantly worrying that our position is not funded or that we may not have a job in the future. Having some job protection.”

“Have a process for special appointments to be become associate, then full professors, even without a tenure track position.”

**Theme 2: Provide a Clear Career Ladder for Faculty off of the Tenure Track** (Provide assistance as non-tenure-track faculty identify and chart new directions for work and opportunities for change.)

- a. Offer a consistent practice for faculty off of the tenure track to establish a career and develop their professional idea.
 

“It would be very helpful if there was a mentor program specifically for non-tenure-track personnel for whom we could find out important information relevant to the position and best options for navigating these positions for mutual benefits/success.”

**Theme 3: Develop Clear and Specific Strategic Plans to Increase Compensation for all NTT Faculty**

“Even non-tenure staff should be considered for merit bonus or compensation on a scale that recognizes experience, willingness to take on new assignments and effectiveness in the classroom.”

“Give the same pay raises to non-tenure-track faculty as other faculty members. Give non tenure-track faculty more information about the probability of future employment and extended contracts.”

“Increase salaries, be more inclusive of all CSU employees, offer opportunities for more employees to contribute their voice in decision making.”

**b. Reorganization**

**a) Policy Clarifications (20)**

- “Revise the salary scale to reward years of teaching in higher education.”
- “Don’t stick to the norms- be open minded about new ideas & processes.”

**b) Of Communication within Department (10)**

- “Ensure non-tenured faculty have a voice at department and college level and rotate those opportunities across the non-tenure faculty, not exclusively with one faculty member.”

**Theme 4: Improve the culture and the climate at CSU to reflect greater valuing of varied faculty appointments and workload responsibilities**

**Theme 5: Increase Shared Governance among faculty and provide options for Non-Tenure-track Faculty to be involved in Departmental, College, and University**

- “If you would consider creating tenure track positions for teaching and still require some professional development for them, it could go a long way in helping them to receive recognition currently denied them the university is extremely hierarchical in nature.”

**Theme 6: Establish Clear and Reasonable Job Descriptions that are relevant and viable Increase awareness of varied job descriptions and varied forms/definitions of productivity**

- “What is the role of research associates/scientists? What support does the department/college provide for these positions? What should their compensation be for the time spent on collect/department level activities such as teaching?”
- “Come up with some clear job duties with Dept. head and be mentored by senior faculty.”
- “Streamline and/or describe the promotion/merit process”
- “Keep representing the special appointment faculty in positive ways.”
- “Require longer-term appointment with a number of classes guaranteed.”

*III. Question 119: Any additional comments.*

More than 145 responded to this section to offer advice, gratitude for the their job as well as additional feedback related to what would be helpful in the next phase of improving the working conditions of non-tenure track faculty at CSU.

**Individual Messages of Note**

MESSAGE: “There are still many people hurting out there in the NTT ranks, especially women. “

MESSAGE: “Survive by keeping your head down.”

MESSAGE: “The responsibilities of NTT are the cast-off functions. We do things the tenure-track faculty don’t want to do. They are sending us all their students and classes.”

MESSAGE: “Candor about conditions is dangerous. Dissent is dangerous.”

MESSAGE: someone still on the list who has left said: “Finding the courage to leave was the best thing I ever did. “

**Career valuing needed—forms: career trajectory, recognitions, support and compensation, recognition of initiative**

5 Salaries remain unacceptable and reflect devaluation of teaching; it’s only a living wage if NTT member is part of a dual-income family. Inequities in pay across campus are “outrageous.”

3-- Seeking a conversion model that’s regularized across campus

2 --Value teaching by valuing teachers

2- Teaching tenure needed; research professor track needed

2—Consistent use of mentors needed

2-Find recognitions—some locations disallow NTTF participation in awards altogether: “My work is not known to my dept. or the U, much less acknowledged for its value.” “Give students more ways to recognize great teaching.” “Revise the reliance on course evaluation surveys.”

2 There remains an absence of meaningful evaluation or observation of teaching.

2- Career trajectory needed for NTTF. Also for a parallel track as research professor: “Being a permanent assistant professor affects my ability to compete for the funding I must have to continue my position.”

2--Online teacher need same hiring mechanisms, promotion opportunities (to STA) and conditions as RI

Supplemental pay needs to be not be capped for NTTF

Count work outside workload distribution if it’s connected to role and contributes to professional stature of individual and program

Clarify how APs and NTTF can give back and become more involved and meaningfully integrated

Annual application and rehire remains the norm in some locations.

Feels discriminated against due to age and gender. Displacement recently due to new TT hire.

**Regularize Appointments and Roles. Communicate University Intentions as EXPECTATIONS for dept. chairs and deans—hold them accountable and have metrics for their performance in this regard**

3. 3--Get message to dept. chairs and deans about the university’s intentions—best laid plans have offered little improvement since last survey
4. 2--Pulling the rug—don’t mentor, develop, and then dismiss. Be consistent and be fair. People move here to take a job and then are jobless a year later.
5. 2--Increasing AP role in teaching—what is the policy?

Regularize policies and appointments –for instance enrollments for class to “make” vary and create unfairness when some classes are cancelled at a low enrollment number while others are allowed to move forward at the same number

Tenuous hiring future needs to be spelled out before people move here

Social Security and PERA should be the standard; DCP is not equivalent. Is it a legal and ethical alternative?

Contracts need to be consistently offered across campus for some sense of commitment, longevity

Professional development and travel monies needed for ongoing professionalization of NTTF

**Participation in Governance is Uneven**

2 Voting rights exclude personnel and curriculum so most time excluded from voting, even where “invited” to be part of governance

Integrate NTTF into departmental culture—still not happening

**Specific locations pointed out**

2 -- INTO is messed up. One person’s reports being “resigned to poor business model and overwork. Slave labor in a corporate setting.” Contract faculty not hired at base rate so tiers

of NTTF exploited. Message sent that “If you don’t like it, leave.” Leave policies never explained. General culture of allowing a pattern of abuse of NTTF.  
Business College does not have recognitions for NTTF